

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/492,521

Applicant(s)

HAYASHI, HISAO

Examiner

Negussie Worku

Art Unit

2626

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Negussie Worku.

(3) Jim Howard.

(2) Kimberly A. Williams.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 May 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Umemoto et al. (US 5013916); Kanemitsu (US 5946427).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Howard emphasized that the claimed predetermined reading position is illuminated by both light sources. Umemoto et al. is agreed to be deficient in this teaching and will be withdrawn.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


KIMBERLY WILLIAMS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required